



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/649,293	08/28/2000	Lawrence T. Cohen	2447-012	7384

22506 7590 06/28/2005

JAGTIANI + GUTTAG  
10363-A DEMOCRACY LANE  
FAIRFAX, VA 22030

EXAMINER

EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3762

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/649,293

Applicant(s)

COHEN, LAWRENCE T.

Examiner

George R. Evanisko

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/22/05 has been entered.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 37-44 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 37, in the next to last line, "are uniformly graduated from a proximal end to a distal end" should be "from a distal end to a proximal end" since the specification describes the array be uniformly graduated from the distal end. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3762

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 29, 30, 32-38, 40-46, and 48-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fu and Shannon, "Effects of Electrode...Implant".

Fu discloses that the system uses a Nucleus-22 Cochlear Implant (title and page 323) and has an active electrode system (the claimed "electrodes") that is uniformly graduated (P0, P1, and P6 in Experiment III). In addition, Fu does meet and is capable of meeting the functional use recitations presented in the claims of having the electrodes correspond to the spacing of auditory receptors, the array using specific frequency bands, and the spacing being determined by a plurality of radially-spaced intercept lines since cochlear electrode array systems are used for specific frequency bands and correspond to auditory receptors so as to stimulate the receptors, and since the spacing of the electrodes being determined by a plurality of radially-spaced intercept lines has not set forth the spacing and since the auditory receptor spacing of the Corti, scala timpani, and cochlear is a relative spacing (depending on the specific person/animal).

In the alternative, Fu discloses the claimed invention having a uniform graduated spacing between active electrodes and that there are inactive/non-functioning electrodes between the

Art Unit: 3762

active electrodes. Fu does not disclose a uniformly graduated spacing between all/any electrodes. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system as taught by Fu, with all/any electrodes having a uniformly graduated spacing between all/any electrodes, since it was known in the art to have cochlear electrode array systems use a higher density of electrodes near the distal end compared to the proximal end and to vary the electrode spacing so as to match auditory receptors, and to remove (manufacture the device without) non-active electrodes to provide a smaller and less expensive device to insert in the ear and to manufacture.

Claims 31, 39, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu and Shannon. Fu and Shannon disclose the claimed invention except for the electrode being curved/constructed to be proximate the inner wall of the scala timpani. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cochlear electrode array as taught by Fu and Shannon, with the array being curved/constructed to be proximate the inner wall of the scala timpani since it was known in the art that cochlear electrode arrays are curved/constructed to be proximate the inner wall of the scala timpani to more effectively stimulate the cochlea and auditory nerve cells.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Berrang is one example of many showing the use of variable electrode spacing and

Art Unit: 3762

shows in figure 2 and describes in columns 7 and 8 the use of an increased electrode density at the distal end compared to the proximal end.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

George R Evanisko  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3762

6/24/5

GRE  
June 24, 2005